

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of April 2, 2004.

All of the Examiner's objections and rejections are traversed.

Reexamination and reconsideration are requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-12, and 17 remain in this application.

Claim 1 is objected to because information recited in parenthesis is not considered part of the claim language. The applicants thank the Examiner for pointing this out and have made the suggested corrections to the claim.

Claims 8, 9, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mima et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0101604 A1).

Claims 1-5, 7, and 17 are allowed.

Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 6, 10, 13-16 and 18-20 are or have previously been canceled.

Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 17 are Distinguished From the Cited Art

Claim 1 has been amended per the Examiner's suggestion. The Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication as to the allowability of claims 1-5, 7, and 17.

Regarding claims 8-12, Applicants have currently amended independent claim 8 so that it is now distinguished from Mima et al by incorporating the limitations of now-canceled claim 10. As claims 9, 11 and 12 refer to and further define this now distinguished claim, it is submitted that these claims are now also distinguished from Mima et al. Therefore, claims 8-9 and 11-12 should now be considered allowable.

the batches is chosen to fully optimize the time period it takes the selected print job to be fully processed.

Claim 13 (canceled).

Claim 14 (canceled).

Claim 15 (canceled).

Claim 16 (canceled).

Claim 17 (original) The method of claim 1, wherein batch sizes are chosen to minimize total time required for complete printing of the print job.

Claim 18 (canceled).

Claim 19 (canceled).

Claim 20 (canceled).

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-12 and 17) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Mark S. Svat, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP



Mark S. Svat
Reg. No. 34,261
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582

4/28/04
Date